

Preliminary DRAFT Cedar River Chinook Population - Tier I - Initial Habitat Project List

Includes Potential Restoration and Protection Projects by Reach

Cedar Lower Reaches 1-11

Basinwide Recommendations:

Project #	Description
c601	Need to evaluate where on the Cedar River can add LWD and implement program to add LWD.

Reach 1: Mouth to Logan St. (RM 1).

Restoration

Technical Hypothesis: Reduce channel confinement, increase pools, large woody debris, and riparian function.

Project #	Reach #	Reach Prot. Benefit Rank	NTAA #	NTAA Name & Description	Approx. Cost	Notes, Key Uncertainties	Benefits to Chinook H, M, L	Feasibil. H, M, L
C201	1	9 of 11	new	Explore Opportunities to Improve Habitat in Reach 1: There are extensive areas of industrial land use in Reach 1 and at the Cedar River mouth. If existing land uses change in the future, explore opportunities to reduce channel confinement, increase riparian function and increase LWD.		Redevelopment may not occur in this area and if it does, it will be in ~15 years. Concern raised about whether this more of a policy/land use issue rather than a project. It will be very difficult to reduce channel confinement in this highly urbanized reach of the river. The US Army Corps of Engineers will have to be consulted on any habitat restoration done in this area.	M	L
C202	1	9 of 11	new	Revegetate right and left bank of Reach 1 where possible. Overhanging vegetation in this area of the river that experiences inundation by the lake is beneficial.		This reach of the river will be dredged in the future. Any planting project in this area will have to consider: flood control requirements, airport safety issues (bird management), park and trail management and public access to the river. Plants will also have to be flood tolerant. Airport has clear zone over park affecting type of vegetation that can be planted. Recreational uses need to be balanced.	H/M	H

Protection

Technical Hypothesis: Pool habitat and the habitat features that support the creation of pools (lwd, riparian function, and channel connectivity) should be maintained.

Project #	Reach #	Reach Prot. Benefit Rank	Existing Prot. Priority (Y/N)	NTAA #	NTAA Name & Description	Approx. Cost	Notes, Key Uncertainties	Benefits to Chinook H, M, L	Feasibil. H, M, L
	1	10 of 11			No projects identified at this time.				

Reach 2: Logan St. Bridge (RM 1) to I-405 (RM 1.6)**Restoration****Technical Hypothesis:** *Reduce channel confinement, increase pools, large woody debris, and riparian function.*

Project #	Reach #	Reach Prot. Benefit Rank	NTAA #	NTAA Name & Description	Approx. Cost	Notes, Key Uncertainties	Benefits to Chinook H, M, L	Feasibil. H, M, L
C203	2	1 of 11	new	Revegetation in Reach 2: Explore options to add native riparian vegetation on left bank of river and for any needed restoration plantings on the right bank.		Any planting projects in this reach will have to consider park and trail management and public access to the river. Opportunities for riparian plantings will be limited due to the Cedar River trail.	H/M	H
C204	2	1 of 11	new	Explore Redevelopment Options in Reach 2: If redevelopment occurs in this reach of river, explore possibility of setting back levees and restoring riparian buffer.		Land use issue as well as project. Left and right bank both need to be considered. High number of landowners lowers feasibility. Habitat improvement in the reach could be encouraged through incentive programs such as density exchanges.	H/M	L

Protection**Technical Hypothesis:** *Pool habitat and the habitat features that support the creation of pools (lwd, riparian function, and channel connectivity) should be maintained.*

Project #	Reach #	Reach Prot. Benefit Rank	Existing Prot. Priority (Y/N)	NTAA #	NTAA Name & Description	Approx. Cost	Notes, Key Uncertainties	Benefits to Chinook H, M, L	Feasibil. H, M, L
C205	2	11 of 11	N	new	Protect and Maintain Existing Riparian Vegetation: Where possible protect and maintain existing tree cover within reach.		Existing cottonwoods near library are nearing end of lifespan and replanting options will need to be explored. Possibly underplant with conifers now and/or replant area when trees are removed (5-10 years out). Need the ability to remove and manage trees.	M	H

Reach 3: I-405 (RM 1.6) to SR169 Bridge (RM 4.2)**Restoration****Technical Hypothesis:** *Reduce channel confinement, increase pools, large woody debris, and riparian function.*

Project #	Reach #	Reach Prot. Benefit Rank	NTAA #	NTAA Name & Description	Approx. Cost	Notes, Key Uncertainties	Benefits to Chinook H, M, L	Feasibil. H, M, L
C206	3	2 of 11	new	In Reach 3, there is an area of industrial use on the right bank of the river that is likely to be redeveloped in the near future. Seek ways to improve riparian habitat on site such as purchasing easement for buffer, removing bank hardening and restoring riparian buffer.		Redevelopment of the site is likely to occur in near term (3 to 5 years) and actual plans are not known. The bulkhead on this site is quite extensive (ranging in height from about 8.5 ft. to 16 ft. and extending approximately 1,150 ft. along the Cedar River), therefore bank hardening removal is likely to be very expensive.	H	M/L
C207	3	2 of 11	new	In Reach 3, there is multi-family residential use on the right bank of river. Explore opportunities to remove impervious surface area and bank hardening on site, and restore riparian buffer.		Apartment complex currently has extensive impervious surface area. Partial buyout would be necessary to achieve High benefits.	H	M/L
C208	3	2 of 11	new	Maplewood Neighborhood Flood Buyouts: Explore possible flood buyouts in this neighborhood and opportunities to restore floodplain. Explore options for bioengineering and softening bank hardening. See recommendation for Maplewood Flood Hazard Reduction in Cedar River Basin Plan.		Cost is high. Extent of benefits depends upon scale of effort. Highest benefits would require extensive work. Other benefits include flood hazard reduction. Flood buyouts alone generally do not provide significant fish benefit, but are a first step to allow for future floodplain restoration. For greatest benefit, flood buyouts should be pursued in concert with a comprehensive habitat restoration effort.	H	L
C209	3	2 of 11	new	Explore any need for riparian restoration in City of Renton-owned parkland upstream of I-405 bridge on left bank. LINKED WITH PROTECTION PROJECT BELOW.		Already well vegetated. Explore diversity of plants, underplanting, and noxious weed control.	H	H

Protection

Technical Hypothesis: Pool habitat and the habitat features that support the creation of pools (lwd, riparian function, and channel connectivity) should be maintained.

Project #	Reach #	Reach Prot. Benefit Rank	Existing Prot. Priority (Y/N)	NTAA #	NTAA Name & Description	Approx. Cost	Notes, Key Uncertainties	Benefits to Chinook H, M, L	Feasibil. H, M, L
C210	3	4 of 11	N	new	Protect existing forested, riparian habitat in City of Renton's parkland upstream of I-405 bridge on left bank. LINKED WITH RESTORATION PROJECT ABOVE.		Renton's three riverside parks (Liberty, Cedar River Park, NARCO property) are going through re-master planning. There are opportunities to move some of more active recreation uses of these parks to former Narco site and protect habitat with more passive recreational uses at the other areas of the parks. Maybe region should look to lower river to provide recreational uses in order to protect upstream habitat.	H	H

Reach 4: SR 169 Bridge (RM 4.2) to Upstream of Landslide (RM 4.7)**Restoration**

Technical Hypothesis: Reduce channel confinement, increase pools, large woody debris, and riparian function.

Project #	Reach #	Reach Prot. Benefit Rank	NTAA #	NTAA Name & Description	Approx. Cost	Notes, Key Uncertainties	Benefits to Chinook H, M, L	Feasibil. H, M, L
C211	4	6 of 11	new	Restore Side-Channel on Right Bank: the Cedar River Basin Plan includes a possible project to restore a side channel on the right bank of the river on property owned by Maplewood Height Home Owners Association and City of Renton across from golf course and downstream of landslide. Channel restoration should be a flow-through channel reconnected to river at upper end for juvenile chinook benefit rather than a groundwater-fed spawning channel (which primarily benefit sockeye).		UW student study was done on this potential restoration project - could be a resource. Landslide changed area extensively, may no longer be a good opportunity for side channel restoration. Needs feasibility study before it can be ranked for benefits. Landslide is a source of fines. No access so difficult to stage restoration. Would be costly. Due to uncertainties about the project, it was not ranked.	?	?
C212	4	6 of 11	new	Riparian restoration in Reach 4: Consider conifer underplanting in forested riparian areas within reach, particularly in Ron Regis park near slide area.		Concern raised that conifer underplantings may not be appropriate in riparian areas along Cedar River. Historic conditions analysis indicates that forested riparian areas in lower Cedar River used to be deciduous. Other plant species or a mix of coniferous and deciduous species might be more in keeping with historic conditions.	H	H

Protection

Technical Hypothesis: Pool habitat and the habitat features that support the creation of pools (lwd, riparian function, and channel connectivity) should be maintained.

Project #	Reach #	Reach Prot. Benefit Rank	Existing Prot. Priority (Y/N)	NTAA #	NTAA Name & Description	Approx. Cost	Notes, Key Uncertainties	Benefits to Chinook H, M, L	Feasibil. H, M, L
C213	4	1 of 11	N	new	Protect Habitat in Reach 4: Protect existing riparian habitat, instream habitat conditions and extensive LWD in reach. Most of reach already in public ownership or protected by regulations (e.g. steep slopes).			H	H
C214	4	1 of 11	N	new	Study Options to Protect Habitat in Reach 4 and Reduce Flooding and Erosion in Ron Regis Park: It is unclear how much further river is going to erode bank and migrate into Ron Regis park in landslide area. Eventually there will be a conflict with park uses. Explore using LWD and levee setback to prevent excessive erosion and flood damage to public lands associated with Ron Regis Park while protecting natural habitat forming processes in reach. Study should include lower Madsen Creek.		Concern was raised that it would be better to just protect this reach and let river find its own equilibrium in area.	H	H

Reach 5: Upstream of Landslide (RM 4.7) to RM 5.8**Restoration**

Technical Hypothesis: Reduce channel confinement, increase pools, large woody debris, and riparian function.

Project #	Reach #	Reach Prot. Benefit Rank	NTAA #	NTAA Name & Description	Approx. Cost	Notes, Key Uncertainties	Benefits to Chinook H, M, L	Feasibil. H, M, L
C215	5	3 of 11	7a,8d	Bucks Curve Buyout and Restoration: Continue buying out structures to build on previous restoration efforts in vicinity of RM 6.2 to RM 6.4. Once sufficient land acquired, remove or setback existing levee, and revegetate floodplain. In best alternative, a portion of SE Jones Road could be relocated northward.	>\$2,000,000 and <\$5,000,000	Flood buyouts alone generally do not provide significant fish benefit, but are a first step to allow for future floodplain restoration. For greatest benefit, flood buyouts should be pursued in concert with a comprehensive habitat restoration effort.	H	H
C216	5	3 of 11	new	Additional Flood Buyouts Near Elliot Bridge: Pursue additional home buyouts (1-2) near Elliot Bridge.		Flood buyouts alone generally do not provide significant fish benefit, but are a first step to allow for future floodplain restoration. For greatest benefit, flood buyouts should be pursued in concert with a comprehensive habitat restoration effort.	M/L	H

Protection

Technical Hypothesis: Pool habitat and the habitat features that support the creation of pools (lwd, riparian function, and channel connectivity) should be maintained.

Project #	Reach #	Reach Prot. Benefit Rank	Existing Prot. Priority (Y/N)	NTAA #	NTAA Name & Description	Approx. Cost	Notes, Key Uncertainties	Benefits to Chinook H, M, L	Feasibil. H, M, L
C217	5	5 of 11	N	new	Protect Riparian Vegetation in Reach 5: Protect riparian vegetation on left bank in area owned by King County.		Similar to Reach 3 recommendations	H	H

Reach 6: RM 5.8 to 7.3**Restoration**

Technical Hypothesis: Reduce channel confinement, increase pools, large woody debris, and riparian function.

Project #	Reach #	Reach Prot. Benefit Rank	NTAA #	NTAA Name & Description	Approx. Cost	Notes, Key Uncertainties	Benefits to Chinook H, M, L	Feasibil. H, M, L
C218	6	7 of 11	7b	Hertzman Floodplain Restoration: Modify Herzmann levee to improve function of and access to floodplain on backside of levee. Modifications could include partial removal or setback. Additional actions include placement of large wood in the river and floodplain, planting native vegetation, and creation of side-channels and backwater areas where possible.	>\$2,000,000 and <\$5,000,000	Project would need to be coordinated and sequenced with other potential projects in this reach. Would be expensive. Extra engineering required.	H	M
C219	6	7 of 11	8k	River Bend Mobile Home Buyout: Purchase property underlying 19 mobile homes nearest river, recontour existing revetment to reduce erosion, flood damage and improve flood conveyance and habitat. Alternatively, purchase all property and remove all mobile homes and the revetment and the downstream levee to create a continuously unarmored left bank from RM 6.5 (outlet of Cavanaugh Pond) to RM 9.5 (Cedar Mtn. Bridge).	>\$2,000,000 and <\$5,000,000	Project would need to be coordinated and sequenced with other potential projects in this reach and with Cedar Rapids floodplain restoration. Flood buyouts alone generally do not provide significant fish benefit, but are a first step to allow for future floodplain restoration. For greatest benefit, flood buyouts should be pursued in concert with a comprehensive habitat restoration effort.	H	M
C220	6	7 of 11	new	Explore Modification of Riverbend Levee: explore partial removal of Riverbend levee in order to reduce channel confinement and connect Cavanaugh Pond to the mainstem river. Modify setback.		There are potential tradeoffs between the existing habitat values provided at Cavanaugh Pond as it is now and what possible salmon habitat could be created with more connection to the river. Project would need to be coordinated and sequenced with other potential projects in this reach. If mobile home park bought out, modify or remove Riverbend levee.	H	M/L
C221	6	7 of 11	new	Continue riparian restoration at Cavanaugh Pond, particularly on river-side of property.		Dependent upon previous two projects.	M	H

Protection

Technical Hypothesis: *Pool habitat and the habitat features that support the creation of pools (lwd, riparian function, and channel connectivity) should be maintained.*

Project #	Reach #	Reach Prot. Benefit Rank	Existing Prot. Priority (Y/N)	NTAA #	NTAA Name & Description	Approx. Cost	Notes, Key Uncertainties	Benefits to Chinook H, M, L	Feasibil. H, M, L
	6	6 of 11			No projects identified at this time.				

Reach 7: RM 7.3 to 8.2**Restoration**

Technical Hypothesis: *Reduce channel confinement, increase pools, large woody debris, and riparian function.*

Project #	Reach #	Reach Prot. Benefit Rank	NTAA #	NTAA Name & Description	Approx. Cost	Notes, Key Uncertainties	Benefits to Chinook H, M, L	Feasibil. H, M, L
C222	7	4 of 11	7j	Cedar Rapids Floodplain Restoration (also named Ricardi): Levee removal and floodplain restoration and revegetation.	>\$500,000 and <\$1,000,000	Project is funded by SRFB. Project would need to be coordinated and sequenced with other potential projects in downstream reach and within reach.	H	H
C223	7	4 of 11	new	Explore options such as easements to protect riparian buffer behind Cook/Jeffries levee and possibly reconnect side channel and/or pond in reach.		Ability to secure necessary easements and acquisitions a factor.	H	L

Protection (Area of high spawning use and egg incubation)

Technical Hypothesis: *Riparian function, lwd and channel connectivity should be maintained.*

Project #	Reach #	Reach Prot. Benefit Rank	Existing Prot. Priority (Y/N)	NTAA #	NTAA Name & Description	Approx. Cost	Notes, Key Uncertainties	Benefits to Chinook H, M, L	Feasibil. H, M, L
C224	7	3 of 11	Y	4e	Ricardi Reach: Acquire additional floodplain area (~15 acres) necessary for restoration project C222 described above.	>\$100,000 and <\$250,000	Acquisition is funded by SRFB.	H	H
C225	7	3 of 11	N	new	Protect pockets of intact riparian forest along Cedar River Trail and SR 169 such as area across from Cook-Jeffries levee.		Trying to do restoration projects in these small areas would encourage people and weeds to follow.	H	H

Reach 8: RM 8.2 to Cedar Mt. Rd. (RM 9.4)**Restoration****Technical Hypothesis:** *Reduce channel confinement, increase pools, large woody debris, and riparian function.*

Project #	Reach #	Reach Prot. Benefit Rank	NTAA #	NTAA Name & Description	Approx. Cost	Notes, Key Uncertainties	Benefits to Chinook H, M, L	Feasibil. H, M, L
C226	8	10 of 11	new	Remove Revetment in Reach 8: Progressive Investment revetment is no-longer maintained. Consider removing remainder of revetment.		The river may have already removed the revetment. Verify if this is indeed still required or remove as a potential project.	H	H
C227	8	10 of 11	new	Study Potential for Restoration on Left Bank of Reach: Protect and maintain intact forested riparian area on left bank owned by King County. Study whether or not better connection of this floodplain to the river could be increased without damaging riparian conditions.		Moved from protection to restoration study. Look at historical photos and data for reach. Benefits to Chinook unknown without study results, so not ranked.	?	M/H

Protection (Area of high spawning use and egg incubation)**Technical Hypothesis:** *Riparian function, lwd and channel connectivity should be maintained.*

Project #	Reach #	Reach Prot. Benefit Rank	Existing Prot. Priority (Y/N)	NTAA #	NTAA Name & Description	Approx. Cost	Notes, Key Uncertainties	Benefits to Chinook H, M, L	Feasibil. H, M, L
C228	8	2 of 11	Y	4i	Jones Reach: 29 acres, 16 parcels targeted for protection. Left bank of river already protected. Acquiring parcels on right bank of the river would allow both banks of the river to be protected.			H	H
C229	8	2 of 11	N	new	Protect Riparian Buffer Behind Levee: Explore options such as easements to protect riparian buffer behind Scott-Indian Grove levee.		Property owner willingness uncertain.	H	L

Reach 9: Cedar Mt. Rd. (RM 9.4) to RM 10.2**Restoration****Technical Hypothesis:** *Reduce channel confinement, increase pools, large woody debris, and riparian function.*

Project #	Reach #	Reach Prot. Benefit Rank	NTAA #	NTAA Name & Description	Approx. Cost	Notes, Key Uncertainties	Benefits to Chinook H, M, L	Feasibil. H, M, L
C230	9	11 of 11	8h	Cedar Mountain Revetment Removal: Acquire sufficient land and setback or remove revetment. Restore and revegetate floodplain.		King County rebuilt bridge and road.	H	L

C231	9	11 of 11	new	WPA Revetment Removal: Acquire sufficient land and setback or remove revetment. Restore and revegetate floodplain.			H	H
------	---	----------	-----	---	--	--	----------	----------

Protection (Area of high spawning use and egg incubation)

Technical Hypothesis: *Riparian function, lwd and channel connectivity should be maintained.*

Project #	Reach #	Reach Prot. Benefit Rank	Existing Prot. Priority (Y/N)	NTAA #	NTAA Name & Description	Approx. Cost	Notes, Key Uncertainties	Benefits to Chinook H, M, L	Feasibil. H, M, L
C232	9	9 of 11	Y	4a	Belmondo Reach: 71 acres, 10 parcels, rural residential, riverfront. No levees in reach, numerous side channels, braided reach.	>\$2,000,000 and <\$5,000,000		H	H

Reach 10: RM 10.2 to just downstream of Taylor Creek (RM 12.7)

Restoration

Technical Hypothesis: *Reduce channel confinement, increase pools, large woody debris, and riparian function.*

Project #	Reach #	Reach Prot. Benefit Rank	NTAA #	NTAA Name & Description	Approx. Cost	Notes, Key Uncertainties	Benefits to Chinook H, M, L	Feasibil. H, M, L
C233	10	5 of 11	7f	Lions Club Side Channel Restoration: Restoration of an ~ 800 foot long historic side channel and associated floodplain for chinook rearing habitat. The Renton Lions Club and King County are potential partners on this project. King County recently purchased property downstream of Lions Club needed for the project.		Lions Club received a SRFB grant to do a feasibility and design study for this project. There are many projects and opportunities in this reach. Need to look at big picture in doing any restoration in this reach so projects done in proper sequence and one action does not preclude other future opportunities.	H	H
C234	10	5 of 11	7g	Byers Reach Side Channel: Levee removal and floodplain restoration on left bank from ~ RM 12.9 to ~ RM 13.3. Some of land for project already has been acquired. Final design and habitat benefits are dependent on available land area.		There are many projects and opportunities in this reach. Need to look at big picture in doing any restoration in this reach so projects done in proper sequence and one action does not preclude other future opportunities.	H	M/L
C235	10	5 of 11	8c	Cedar Grove Road Levee Removal: Conduct further levee modification work to maximize channel-floodplain interactions.	>\$500,000 and <\$1,000,000	There are many projects and opportunities in this reach. Need to look at big picture in doing any restoration in this reach so projects done in proper sequence and one action does not preclude other future opportunities. Project limited by need to protect trail.	M	H

C236	10	5 of 11	8f	Cedar Grove Mobile Home Park Flood Buyout and Levee Removal: Purchase mobile home property and relocate approximately 55 mobile homes; purchase and remove 9 single-family homes, and restore ~40 acres of floodplain area with riparian vegetation and off-channel features.	\$5,000,000-\$7,000,000	There are many projects and opportunities in this reach. Need to look at big picture in doing any restoration in this reach so projects done in proper sequence and one action does not preclude other future opportunities. Cost may be factor. Flood buyouts alone generally do not provide significant fish benefit, but are a first step to allow for future floodplain restoration. For greatest benefit, flood buyouts should be pursued in concert with a comprehensive habitat restoration effort.	H	M/L
C237	10	5 of 11	8i	Cedar Grove Road Junkyard Buyout: Acquire left bank parcels in vicinity of RM 14 used for junk salvage operation and restore floodplain. Adjacent to C238, consider combining.		There are many projects and opportunities in this reach. Need to look at big picture in doing any restoration in this reach so projects done in proper sequence and one action does not preclude other future opportunities.	H	M/L
C238	10	5 of 11	8e	Pursue Additional Buyouts near McDonald Levee: Acquire additional developed properties on left bank in vicinity of McDonald levee and modify levee and restore floodplain. Adjacent to C237, consider combining.		If enough buyouts occur in McDonald levee area, road could be set back to open up more floodplain area. New development should be avoided in this bend of river. There are many projects and opportunities in this reach. Need to look at big picture in doing any restoration in this reach so projects done in proper sequence and one action does not preclude other future opportunities. Flood buyouts alone generally do not provide significant fish benefit, but are a first step to allow for future floodplain restoration. For greatest benefit, flood buyouts should be pursued in concert with a comprehensive habitat restoration effort.	H	M/L

Protection

Technical Hypothesis: Pool habitat and the habitat features that support the creation of pools (lwd, riparian function, and channel connectivity) should be maintained.

Project #	Reach #	Reach Prot. Benefit Rank	Existing Prot. Priority (Y/N)	NTAA #	NTAA Name & Description	Approx. Cost	Notes, Key Uncertainties	Benefits to Chinook H, M, L	Feasibil. H, M, L
C239	10	8 of 11	Y	4g	Lower Lions Stream Reach: 39 acres, 12 parcels, including a large area of riparian forested floodplain between the Cedar River and SE 188th Street. Chinook use the mainstem of the areas of interest within this reach. A past floodplain buyout is adjacent to the left bank area as well as an approximate 15-acre private land holding managed for educational and conservation purposes located just upriver. A portion of this reach is necessary to accommodate restoration project C233 in its entirety.	>\$1,000,000 and <\$2,000,000		H	M
C240	10	8 of 11	Y	4j	Byers Reach: 58 acres, 17 parcels. Includes developed and undeveloped properties on right and left bank. These properties are necessary for project C234.	>\$2,000,000 and <\$5,000,000		H	M

Reach 11: Just downstream of Taylor Creek (RM 12.7) to RM 13.8**Restoration**

Technical Hypothesis: Reduce channel confinement, increase pools, large woody debris, and riparian function.

Project #	Reach #	Reach Prot. Benefit Rank	NTAA #		Approx. Cost	Notes, Key Uncertainties	Benefits to Chinook H, M, L	Feasibil. H, M, L
C241	11	8 of 11	7c	Partial Removal Jan Road and Rutledge/Johnson Levees: Modify or remove approximately 500 linear feet from the downstream end of the Jan Road Levee and the Rutledge-Johnson Revetment, leaving a sufficient length intact at the upstream end to prevent damage to the remaining facility and maintain the current flood protection to residents' homes. The right bank modifications are part of project C234.	>\$250,000 and <\$500,000	Need 218 side channel property.	H	M
C242	11	8 of 11	7h	Enhance 218th side channel once protected, see C244 below. Also related to C241 above.		Mostly vegetation. Benefits to Chinook- maybe connect channel.	H/M	M

C243	11	8 of 11	7d	Getchman Levee Setback: Remove or setback Getchman levee from ~RM 13.7 to 13.9 to allow channel-floodplain interactions. Additional land still needed for the project. As part of this project, pursue additional buyouts behind Rhode levee on left bank across from Getchman levee.	>\$250,000 and <\$500,000	Flood buyouts alone generally do not provide significant fish benefit, but are a first step to allow for future floodplain restoration. For greatest benefit, flood buyouts should be pursued in concert with a comprehensive habitat restoration effort.	H	M
------	----	---------	----	--	---------------------------------	---	----------	----------

Protection

Technical Hypothesis: Pool habitat and the habitat features that support the creation of pools (lwd, riparian function, and channel connectivity) should be maintained.

Project #	Reach #	Reach Prot. Benefit Rank	Existing Prot. Priority (Y/N)	NTAA #	NTAA Name & Description	Approx. Cost	Notes, Key Uncertainties	Benefits to Chinook H, M, L	Feasibil. H, M, L
C244	11	7 of 11	Y	4b	218th Place Side Channel: Protect 5 acres, 1 parcel, rural residential, riverfront. Once acquired there are opportunities for habitat enhancement in floodplain and off-channel areas. Related to C242.	>\$250,000 and <\$500,000		H	H
C245	11	7 of 11	Y	4h	Mouth of Taylor Creek Reach: Acquire approximately 40 acres of forested riparian floodplain associated with both the Cedar mainstem and the lower reach of Taylor Creek. The target parcels include approximately 1,000 feet of mainstem channel, nearly 1,300 feet of the lowermost reach and mouth of Taylor Creek, and one of the largest remaining floodplain wetlands adjacent to the mainstem. Some of the acquisitions will facilitate future levee removal and/or modification projects.		Approximately 2 acres at the Taylor Creek confluence have already been acquired.	H	H